2

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 010 406 04

PARTICIPANT-OBSERVATIONAL STUDY OF THE PRINCETON SUMMER STUDIES PROGRAM FOR ENVIRONMENTALLY DEPRIVED HIGH SCHOOL BOYS.

BY- BRESSLER, MARVIN WILCOX, PRESTON
PRINCETON UNIV., N.J.

REPORT NUMBER BR-5-8114 PUB DATE SEP 66
REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-128
CONTRACT OEC-5-10-061
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$2.40 60P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CREATIVE THINKING, *SUMMER PROGRAMS, *STUDENT MOTIVATION, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, CREATIVE DEVELOPMENT, LEARNING ACTIVITIES, HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, *DISADVANTAGED ENVIRONMENT, NEGRO STUDENTS, MALES, SELF EXPRESSION, SELF CONCEPT, OBSERVATION, PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

A SUMMER PROGRAM WAS CONDUCTED FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTHS TO ENGAGE IN ACTIVITIES OF CREATIVE THINKING AND EXPRESSION, WIDE EXPLORATION, FREE QUESTIONING, AND SELF-ESTEEM DEVELOPMENT. FORTY HIGH SCHOOL SOPHOMORE BOYS (PREDOMINATELY NEGRO) WERE COUNSELED, GUIDED, AND INSTRUCTED IN SUCH SUBJECT AREAS AS LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART. THE RESEARCH METHOD EMPLOYED WAS PARTICIPANT-OBSERVATION, SUPPLEMENTED BY RECORD EXAMINATIONS AND SPECIALLY DEVISED SURVEYS. A POST-ANALYSIS SUGGESTED THAT MANY OF THE STUDENT PARTICIPANTS EXHIBITED INCREASED ACADEMIC PROFICIENCY, BETTER ATTITUDES TOWARD LEARNING, AND GREATER PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES. INDICATIONS WERE THAT A SIMILAR PROGRAM MIGHT BE ADVANTAGEOUSLY ADOPTED IN MANY GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS. (RS)

ED010406

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 5-8114
Contract No. OE 5-10-061

PARTICIPANT-OBSERVATIONAL STUDY OF THE PRINCETON SUMMER STUDIES PROGRAM FOR ENVIRONMENTALLY DEPRIVED HIGH SCHOOL BOYS

September 1966

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Participant-Observational Study of the Princeton Summer Studies Program for Environmentally Deprived High School Boys

Cooperative Research Project 5-8114
Contract No. OE 5-10-061

Marvin Bressler
and
Preston Wilcox

September 1966

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Princeton University

Princeton, New Jersey

	Page No.
Acknowledgments	iii
Introduction	1
Method	4
Results	7
The Students	7
Staff	8
Administrative Leadership	8
Faculty	9
Psychologist	10
House Parents	11
Counselors	11
Environment	13
The Setting	13
University and Community	13
A Negro at Princeton	15
The Program	20
The Academic Dimension	20
Extracurricular Activities	25
Some Consequences of the Program: For the Students	34
According to the Faculty	34
According to the Parents	35
According to the Students	36
Some Additional Consequences of the Program	39
Discussion	41
Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations	47
Recommendations for data collection	50
Recommendations relating to the involvement of the parents in the Program	51
Recommendations for clarification of goals and objectives for the students	52
Recommendations for utilization of of student organizational resources	53
Summary	54

Acknowledgments

The on-site observations and the subsequent surveys of the first Princeton Summer Studies Program in 1964 were performed entirely by Preston Wilcox. A heavy schedule during the last two years made it impossible for Mr. Wilcox to complete his account of this project. Accordingly, Marvin Bressler, working from a preliminary draft of Wilcox's findings and drawing on other sources, brought the project to its conclusion. When time permits, Wilcox may still publish an expanded version of these materials, incorporating many insights which are the unique property of one who has lived with the boys and shared their experiences. Such a volume when it appears will undoubtedly contain data and emphases that are not now represented, but it will not contradict the information in the current effort.

It is customary in participant-observational studies to express gratitude to the subjects of the inquiry -- in this case, the staff, faculty, parents, and students who exhibited such rare dedication. We do so here with genuine conviction and sincerity. For by their combined efforts, they converted the ominous phrase "the long, hot summer" from a symbol of drought and violence to a season of growth.

Introduction

Equal educational opportunity is both a principle of justice and a central requirement for a democratic society. The schools at all levels -- elementary, secondary, and college -- are principal mechanisms for discovering talent, maintaining social tranquility, and redressing some of the arbitrary inequities of birth and position. Yet it is common knowledge that Negroes and other disadvantaged groups are underrepresented in quality institutions of higher learning, including Ivy universities. Many educators shared the view of President Robert F. Goheen of Princeton University that such institutions must "add their strengths to the effort to develop an educated leadership drawn from all levels of the American society." A major obstacle to the achievement of this goal is the distressingly small number of adequately trained and motivated Negro candidates who apply to the nation's high-ranking universities and colleges.

The announced purpose of the Princeton Summer Studies Program of 1964 was to enlarge the pool of such candidates, but as it evolved it developed additional aims. This report describes some of the salient features of the Program and its consequences, and also includes speculations on its wider significance.

The Program was financed by a generous grant from the Rockefeller Foundation and supplemented by funds from Princeton University. The students, who were New Jersey high school boys who had completed their sophomore year, were nominated by their high schools on the basis of specific selection procedures and criteria which were worked out with each cooperating school, and finally selected on consultation with the PSSP staff. The cooperating schools were specifically instructed that potentiality for intellectual and social leadership was to be the primary criterion for selection. Achievements, such as high grades, top class ranking, election to class or school offices, etc., were not to be a principal basis for nomination. Rather, PSSP emphasized that it wished to engage those students who were not fully committed to academic work and who could profit from added stimulation. It was hoped that, as such students encountered new experience, their increased confidence in themselves and awareness of educational opportunities would raise their educational aspirations. Indeed, the major assumption underlying the entire Program was that previous academic performance was a poor indicator of innate talent and potential achievement for those students who came from areas where economic deprivation was greatest, and where intellectual stimulation as an environmental factor is minimal.

The students were housed in University dormitories together with Princeton undergraduates who were members of the PSSP staff. Meals were served in Wilcox Hall, where other groups participating in various University summer institutes also dined. Thus, PSSP students were able to develop some understanding of the variety of activities that occur within a university. This widening view of university life was emphasized by exposing students to the classrooms, lecture halls, laboratories, libraries and studios where their daily activities occurred. In addition, the Program availed itself of many recreational facilities -- game rooms, swimming pool, tennis courts, baseball diamonds, running track, and athletic fields -- normally used by the college students.

English studies, science, sculpture, and painting formed the academic core of instruction, and a special effort was made to select subject matter that was significant for contemporary life and salient to the students' interest. In the words of a brochure explaining the program: "Meaning and identity might justifiably be called the hidden curriculum, for all instruction will be aimed at helping each student identify himself and the social context of his life. Mastery of study skills and techniques will be encouraged, although the curriculum will not be remedial in intent. There will be a strong emphasis on inductive and experiential approaches to learning, for experience indicates that conceptualization and verbalization are most meaningfully the result of knowledge gained by discovering and of relationships made in perceiving."

The staff, which included University and high school faculty as well as Princeton undergraduates, were selected for their ability to stimulate inquiry and freedom of expression, and for their general understanding "of the way in which specific subjects and skills relate to the broad framework of knowledge that characterizes man as an organized social being." An important consideration was their capacity to communicate with high school students and their ability to respond to the unpredictable demands and needs of their pupils.

Because the job of changing attitudes and increasing motivation cannot yield an immediate and sustained result in a relatively short period of time, in this case six weeks, PSSP maintained the relationship with each boy throughout the following year. Members of the PSSP staff were available to confer with their former students, to engage in tutorial correspondence, and in general to respond to the individual needs of each PSSP alumnus. High school

teachers drew on PSSP resources for cultural trips, books and other educational materials. This post-campus phase was considered essential by the sponsors of the Program because, as a pilot demonstration seeking new ways and techniques to enhance educational achievement, PSSP recognized the need for provision of continuous encouragement and assistance.

Since the problems of underachievement and motivation appear most graphically and acutely in urban areas, PSSP sought primarily to cooperate with big city high schools.

This Program, then, if successful and adopted widely could be an important contribution to making quality higher education available to a larger segment of the population. Under the circumstances, it seemed clearly obligatory to study its procedures and results. Widespread interest in the educational problems of the disadvantaged is relatively new. At present educational experimentation of this character must proceed on the basis of inferences derived from the mainstream of educational scholarship, the scanty literature in the area, and by ad hoc improvisation.

Patricia Sexton's Education and Income (1961) was the first full-scale study documenting the deleterious effects of environmental deprivation and inferior schooling on low income children. Frank Reissman's The Culturally Deprived Child (1962) summarizes the fragmentary data on this topic and includes suggestions on the manner in which the schools can deal with this problem. A. Harry Passow (ed.) Education in Depressed Areas (1963) is a compilation of empirical and speculative essays that deal with various problems of education in slum schools. It is clear that, if we are to move beyond these pioneer efforts, it will be necessary for us to continue to collect data, establish empirical generalizations, and construct theories on the cultural, situational, and personality determinants of "successful" outcomes associated with programs for the disadvantaged.

Method

As a precondition for more austere and structured research, it will be necessary for social science investigators to immerse themselves in the total culture of such programs in order to develop productive hypotheses that are worthy of further study.

This preliminary phase, known commonly as "participant-observation," essentially a euphemism for journalism sensitized by social science concepts, might yield clues on questions such as the following which could be systematically studied at Princeton and elsewhere during subsequent years:

1. Can a brief program introduced during the high school years overcome the multiple effects of previous environmental deprivation?
2. Should such programs be conducted in the boys' immediate environment or in the university campus setting?
3. Is the "university" a single culture, or does it differ markedly from campus to campus?
4. What are the criteria of "successful" outcomes? Are these to be defined by ultimate admission to a "quality" school, a lesser institution, by increased mastery of cognitive skills, by greater personality adequacy, or by standards not yet specified or perceived?
5. How important are race, definable personality traits, family structure, the adolescent cult of masculinity, and other non-intellective factors in promoting or inhibiting desired responses to the varied aspects of the program?
6. Is it possible to develop an optimum curriculum and teaching methods that are especially appropriate for environmentally deprived students?
7. Does contact with middle-class models increase the boys' aspiration level, or does the social distance between staff and student produce apathy by reinforcing the boys' sense of inadequacy?
8. Are the norms for the group defined by peers or by the instructional staff?
9. Are the boys' progress in the program tend to be "linear" or or does it proceed "cyclically" or in some other fashion?

These questions are stated very crudely and they are certainly not exhaustive, but even these could not be satisfactorily and definitively answered in the course of this investigation. Indeed, no participant-observation study could hope to deal with them in any definitive sense. We relied on this method of inquiry with full awareness of its potentiality and limits. It is the least structured of all the tools of scientific investigation, but it is valuable if it is recognized that participant-observation represents the first, rather than the final, stage of the total research effort. The findings of such studies may originate by observations -- indeed, that is their purpose -- but it cannot confirm them. Within these limits, participant-observation is an invaluable device for suggesting problems, hypotheses, and theories that can be systematically investigated by more refined methods.

The participant-observer in this study followed some of the common practices of all such studies: 1) sharing in the life activities of the group to be observed; 2) eliciting information from "informants"; 3) taking "the role of the other"; and 4) maintaining a delicate equilibrium of personal involvement and detachment.

Mr. Wilcox, who was introduced to the students as the program "historian," placed a greater emphasis on his "participant" role than is common in most social research. This decision was explicit and was based on his philosophical and methodological convictions. According to Wilcox:

> Human objectivity is impossible . . . A participant-observer in most cases influences merely by his presence. If one accepts his inability to be totally objective, then his responsibility is three-fold: 1)He must attempt to be aware of his biases and attempt to know when they have been called into play; he must also identify them for his readers. 2) He must know exactly when his influence is being brought to bear, why, and the consequences of the use of such influence. 3) He must not worry about becoming a full member of the group he is observing. By definition, he can never become a full member. He is forever marginal, so there is no need to be concerned about it.

The sources of data for the observations reported in this study included the conventional repretoire of social science techniques. Wilcox analyzed tape recordings of group discussions, reports by faculty and other members of the staff, student journals, interviews and statistical materials. He mingled with students and staff in the dormitories, in some classes and recreational areas, and in informal "discussion centers" which developed in the course of the Program.

It should be evident that this study did not confine itself to the effects of the curriculum. In fact, since several of the instructors believed that the presence of an observer might inhibit their effectiveness, the purely academic phase is lest well documented. But there is reason to believe that the total environment of the PSSP rather than its formal program of instruction was responsible for whatever success it achieved. Little substantive knowledge can be transmitted in any brief period; it is possible to convey the view that learning is both possible and desirable, and that is moreover an instrument for making the world habitable. Discerning the process by which this insight is absorbed requires the wisdom of a philosopher, the techniques of a social scientist, and the sensibility of the artist. These traits are seldom combined in any one man or research team, but it is hoped that, in the process of imposing some semblance of order on a necessarily untidy social experiment, we shall not have concealed the drama of helpers and helped enriching each other's lives.

Results

Reduced to its essentials, the PSSP of 1964 consisted of 1) students and 2) staff interacting in a partially controlled 3) environment that was designed to produce changes in each. Successful outcomes require sufficient congruence between these elements to establish the points of contact on which learning depends and enough novelty and challenge to stimulate change. Something approximating these conditions existed in the PSSP. The students might properly be described as "disadvantaged," but taken as a whole they were hardly recruited from the most deprived segment of the population; the Princeton setting was alien and forbidding to many of the participants, but the staff, including a number of youthful intermediaries and persons of like social origin helped to cushion the process of adjustment; and the University committed its resources more generously than can ordinarily be anticipated in compensatory programs.

These conditions can seldom be duplicated in urban settings where educational problems are most acute and the generalizability of the impressions recorded in this study is accordingly limited. A brief description of the participants, their mentors, and the setting in which they influenced each other may be helpful in making their behavior and responses intelligible.

The Students

The student body consisted of 29 Negroes, nine whites, and two Puerto Rican boys who had completed their sophomore year in high school. About half of the boys resided in the city of their birth and of the migrants one-fourth had been born in the southern United States and Puerto Rico. With a single exception, all of the students lived in homes with the mother present, but about one-fourth of the total group, and one-third of the Negroes, came from families in which the father was absent as a result of death, divorce, desertion, or separation.

The median family income as of 1963 for the entire group was approximately $5,950, about $50 less than the national average. About one-fourth of the families may be classified at the "poverty" level (under $4,000) and an additional one-third at the "deprived" level ($4,000 to $6,000), with Negroes and Puerto Ricans disproportionately represented in both categories.

According to a partial census, the parents of the boys completed an average of eleven years of schooling, somewhat higher than

the educational achievement level of the American population. Nearly one-fifth of all the parents had college degrees, half of the group had completed high school or beyond, and nearly four-fifths had at least an eighth-grade education. However, somewhat more than one-fifth of the parents were "functional illiterates." It is significant that all wished their sons to attend college (most named Princeton), but few had made specific financial provisions for this goal.

Well over three-fifths of all the Negro mothers were employed outside the home, and nearly half of these were the sole breadwinners. The difficulties of this situation become clear when we consider that their income on the average supported four children.

The housing patterns of the student population reflected their economic characteristics. One-fourth lived in public housing, an additional one-third lived in private rental units, while two-fifths lived in homes owned by their families.

In sum, the social characteristics of the students and their families, including the Negro population, can hardly be described as extravagantly favorable to the prospects of educational success, but neither are they as desperate as for much of deprived American youth.

Staff

The staff consisted of five elements: 1) administrative leadership, 2) faculty, 3) the psychologist, 4) house parents, and 5) counselors.

Administrative Leadership

The official leadership of the Program was furnished by a Director and a Program Coordinator. The former is a professor of geology and Chairman of the Advisory Committee of the Junior High School Science Project, an experimental program in curriculum development. His experience with this effort had enlarged his understanding of some aspects of the public school system. A steady, methodological and responsive prodder, he could listen to problems with interest, appreciate small increments of growth, and hold court with teens without pretending to be a fountainhead of all knowledge. He appeared to enjoy having students puzzle, search, and risk. During the barbershop incident, described later in this report, he took vigorous action against race prejudice and discrimination. By so doing, he proved to the students that he shared their indignation. His gift from the students and counselors at the final

banquet was a barber pole; his legacy to them was the opportunity to meet an adult who behaved responsibly when it mattered.

The Program Coordinator, a professor of psychology at one of the state teachers colleges, had the most demanding, ambiguous and visible assignment. In dealing with the daily operation of the Program, he tried to reconcile the sometimes competing claims of spontaneity and organization. He could have elected to establish "orderly" administrative practices, or to proceed with as little structure as possible. The Coordinator chose the latter course on the assumption that neither learning nor organization should be imposed from on high. He was, by conviction, permissive and wished above all that students and staff should be self-directive.

This effort was not always welcomed; some of the counselors would have appreciated more specific instructions. In numerous gripe sessions, murmurings about "indecisiveness," "lack of communication," "indefinite policy," and so forth suggested that they would have preferred more exercise of authority.

The model of leadership based on a consultative Director and a non-directive Coordinator is most vulnerable when the Program extends over a very limited time span. The uncertainties and the continuing joint search for solutions to pressing problems began to achieve a level of stability as the campus phase of the Program was terminating. It is not clear whether this process can be hastened.

Faculty

The faculty was recruited from both secondary schools and the University. The public school contingent included teachers from Chicago, Long Island, and Princeton; the college group, except for one man from a New England institution, were all members of the Princeton faculty. The teaching staff represented a wide spectrum of styles, from flamboyant bravura to serenely Socratic, but they shared several characteristics in common. Each tried to help the student utilize and develop his own resources; each avoided the lecture system; each was receptive to student response and encouraged their pupils to question, probe and challenge. All enjoyed the art of teaching and managed to convey their enthusiasm.

During the second week of the Program, the faculty began to meet the students in individual conferences. It was not unusual to observe students and faculty eating together at various localities on the campus. Useful information obtained in this fashion was exchanged at staff meetings and more casual occasions.

There is a good deal of evidence that the students appreciated the efforts of their teachers. The following excerpts from student interviews will give some indication of their reactions:

> The teachers express themselves -- and help in stimulating your thinking far beyond what is there . . . Mr. __ is a real nice guy. He knows how to get you interested in a story and how to get the most out of you. He made you feel that literature could be fun as well as educational. . . . Miss __ and Mr. __ 'lot of fun'! She could make us find out things for ourselves. She could tell us little fibs that were actually right. She would say, 'I don't know, find out for yourself.' . . . made us think more . . . teachers are more friendly than most teachers I have been taught by . . . discussed all kinds of literature; allowed criticism, part of free speech; talk our own language -- even in slang, teacher still understands. . . . In school, teachers would ask you to say it over again, while here the teachers know what you are talking about . . . used to think that professors were odd; now I see that they are human . . . I learned teachers can be wrong . . .

Two students who were not among those quoted above provide what is perhaps the best summary of the faculty. "In my school," said one, "teachers teach facts. Here at Princeton, they teach to stimulate," and another added "back home, you study for tests; here you study for pleasure . . . Here, teachers get to know you personally. You have fifteen-minute conferences with them and they speak to you, ask you how you are doing, and they are just friendly . . . Teachers here make you feel they are your friends . . . not somebody you despise." The perception of the teacher as a person and perhaps even as a friend seems to have been a novel experience for most of the students.

In a follow-up survey of the "most meaningful event" experienced by the students, "relationships with teachers" was the highest ranking response and "method of teaching" was second. It is given to few teachers to receive such testimony.

Psychologist

A psychologist was associated with the Program to aid students who were experiencing difficulties. His chief task was to conduct group discussions which on some occasions apparently gave the participants greater insight into the dynamics of their motivation.

His effectiveness was restricted by the fact that his contact with students tended to be formal, and that many were reluctant to avail themselves of his services because they feared that they would be regarded as "kooks."

House Parents

The house parents were a Trenton teacher and his wife who performed the usual functions associated with custodial regulations in the dormitory.

Counselors

The counselors performed a great variety of roles. They acted as tutors, served as "big brother" dormitory mates, and directed recreational activities. These tasks were entrusted to a total complement of eight Princeton undergraduates, three recent alumni, and one graduate of a nearby urban university. In ethnic and religious backgrounds, they were in no sense representative of the Princeton student body. More than half were either Negro (four) or Jewish (three), one was Italian and only one-third were white Protestant.

It is really difficult to overestimate the importance of counselors to the Program. They worked an average of fourteen to sixteen hours a day, attended and made special presentations before classes, helped their charges to think through their homework, to look ahead to the future and to assume more responsibility. It was they who were perhaps most instrumental in legitimatizing the value of education for the student group.

The counselors also acted as social brokers between the students and the administration. When the students met to form informal groups, a counselor was invited to participate. When the students objected to the behavior of staff members, the counselors could help restore peace. When a student was stimulated or perplexed by some aspect of his new experience, he could rely on a willing listener.

The importance of race in defining the interactions of students and counselors is somewhat complex. By way of gross generalization, it may be said that this factor was highly significant as a situational determinant, which is to say that some occasions stimulated racially conditioned expectations and responses. One student's reaction to the barbershop incident is instructive:

As far as it goes with the incident about the barbershop, how the University plans to take care of it . . . I don't think that the student body thinks so much that it is the University, but that it is the white participation in the University . . . Now they feel that people care, especially some white people. And they don't get the idea that all white people are bad; so by S. W. [a white counselor] expressing himself in the situation, that we should do something about it . . . this is why I felt that there was a response and clapping and so on like that. They feel that if it were done in another situation where a Negro might have said, let's do something about it, the applause might not have come. But coming from a Caucasian, this was something significant and not their own race you know.

When the same student was asked how the events in the barbershop would have been brought to the attention of the administration if the white counselor had not taken the first steps to do so, he replied:

Well, I believe that it would have been brought up by the fact that anything that we want made known to the administration staff, we usually do it through my counselor, I know I personally do it. We would have probably told C. C. for two reasons. We feel that C. C. is one of the kind of counselors that is more close to the students because in a way he is more like the student himself. Plus the fact that he is a Negro and we would rather approach a Negro with this problem than to go forth and approach anyone else. So this is how I feel. It would have been brought up by taking it to one of the 12:30 meetings that the counselors have every day and then they would direct it on to the administration staff.

Mr. Wilcox: When you said that C. C. is a 'special contact,' you made two observations about him. One was that he was more like you and second that he is Negro. Now, excluding the part about him being a Negro, what do you mean that he is more like you?

Student: What I meant by saying that C. C. was more closer to the students was because that he seems to understand. He is not that old, by law he is not a man yet, he is just 19 years old. He knows how to communicate with us, not with the language spoken in class, but with the slang language used by kids today. This is something that is very important, I feel. This is why I feel that sometimes the social workers don't succeed is because [it's] true, they talk to an individual that's been suppressed and things like that, but they don't talk to him in the language that he can be communicated in with. And this is what C. C. does.

Mr. Wilcox: I would just like to go one step further on the second question. Now, you said that C. C. is a Negro. Now, supposing there was this counselor who was white who also talked the language. Do you think he might have been the one the group would have gone to? This may be a loaded question.

Student: Being very blunt about it and just really giving an answer, no, I don't believe so. I don't believe even though the situation was as pressing as it was, I don't believe that it would have been brought to this channel. One more reason is because that I feel that me being a Negro and all the rest of the Negro boys I know would rather tell one of their own race about something that happened directly upon them by another race than to tell someone of the race that had suppressed them, that they were suppressed by their race. So I feel that it would have never [been brought up]; whether this person could have communicated with us or not, and I don't feel that we would have ever got that channel to the administration staff.

Despite color consciousness in specific situations where it was relevant, there is reason to believe that, for the most part, the students responded to counselors in "human" rather than racial terms. When the students were asked to indicate the counselor with whom they had developed the "most meaningful relationship," most students both Negro and white expressed a preference for white counselors. This choice seems not to have been dictated by imputations of racial superiority or shame, but rather by more universalistic considerations.

Environment

The Setting

University and Community

The community of Princeton is widely reputed to be a citadel of aloof, white, upper income, Protestant culture. It is very largely inhabited by University personnel, exurbanites, a sizable colony of old Italian families, and a small Negro community that mainly caters to the needs of their more affluent neighbors. It does not resemble the communities of origin --- urban, low income, congested --- of most of the students. However, since most of their activities took place on the University campus, the community as such played no great role in their lives.

The University itself made much more than a token effort to advance the success of the Program. It is, of course, among the most dis-

tinguished of Ivy universities, perhaps the Iviest, but it placed its considerable resources at the disposal of the students and their families. From the very outset, it had taken special pains to treat the PSSP as a favorite child. As Laurence B. Holland reported in an article appearing in the Princeton Alumni Weekly of October 20, 1964:

> If things seemed formidable on July 5th (and most of us, student and staff alike, were worried about our inexperience of one sort or another, and were expecting a rough time), the festive affair which opened the Program on July 6th was reassuring and showed, though we may not have seen it at once, how lucky we all were. For one thing, the University (which had launched the Program on its own initiative and, with Rockefeller Foundation help, was to buy all the students' books, pay all the expenses, and even buy my lunch) was clearly putting itself out. Whereas it had once anticipated greeting merely the forty students with their parents and staff, it was now serving a buffet to some 300 people: staff and families, local friends of the Program, students, parents, brothers and sisters, remoter relatives, and friends who had made the trip to the campus from Jersey City and Newark, Burlington, Trenton, and Princeton. If the University was underscoring its commitment to the enterprise, the families and friends were making equally clear their excitement at the prospect for their sons, brother or nephews. It was a highly charged atmosphere of hope, encouragement, and expectations which had surrounded the students since their selection in the spring.

The University did more than rely on inspiration. Although the Program conducted most of its activities in the well-appointed Wilcox Hall complex, it was supported by a variety of campus agencies.

The participant-observer was an agent of the Council on Human Relations, an interdisciplinary committee of social scientists whose major function is to conduct research in areas of humane concern. The University's anti-poverty wing, the Bureau of Student Aid, provided 38 on-campus jobs for the forty students. Those who desired to do so could work one hour per day at $1 per hour. Two students continued to work on a full-time basis between the end of the campus Program and the beginning of their own school year. Another who was interested in computers was permitted to work with such equipment and was later tutored in mathematics by a Princeton undergraduate. Still another who performed routine bibliographical tasks in connection with a faculty research project on Zen Buddhism became absorbed in the subject and engaged in long and stimulating discussions with the project director.

Many of the jobs were directly related to the PSSP. Several of the students served as messengers for the administrative staff; others "covered" the desk in the Julian Street Library in Wilcox Hall. Still others who were interested in photography helped compile a pictorial record of the Program. One assisted the house parents. It should be emphasized that none of these jobs were "made" work, and the students had no reason to feel that dimunition of pride which occurs when human beings feel they are the beneficiaries of "handouts."

The McCosh Infirmary also served as a place of employment. One faculty member will long recall how she established her eligibility for service at the Infirmary by invoking the name of her pupil. As a member of a disadvantaged minority on an all male campus, she needed influence.

The cafeteria, dormitory, bookstore, library, and recreational facilities received steady use. President Goheen's private, outdoor basketball court became "Madison Square Garden" while the gymnasium was undergoing repair. Such was their prowess that at the end of the season they forwarded a replacement for the worn-out net. The gameroom and the cafeteria in Wilcox Hall served as social centers, where students mingled with youth from Princeton and came to know students from other universities who were enrolled in other summer institutes. Finally, the Summer Studies Office of the University performed a variety of administrative functions. Obviously, the summer Program exploited the resources of nearly every sector of the University.

A Negro at Princeton

Despite the relatively benign atmosphere of town and campus, Negro students and staff were sometimes subjected to humiliating and embarrassing experiences:

- --- a Negro faculty member experienced some difficulty in placing his child in a local day camp program
- --- a counselor recalled that, upon his arrival at the University, he was refused admission to the gym, apparently on the assumption that by definition Negroes could not be students
- --- a person associated with the Program was once shopping when he experienced the classic Negro stereotypical imputation. He was standing near some watermelons in the food section when an elderly lady asked him to pass on their merits. He was pleased that she regarded him as a fruit connoisseur.

The most dramatic and educationally significant incident involving Negro discrimination and prejudice was the affair of the barbershop. It may be best described by quoting a series of documents by the leading actors.

From the students to the most widely circulated local newspaper:

Forty high school sophomores were chosen throughout New Jersey to attend a special educational program at Princeton University. We are members of this Princeton Summer Studies Program.

On July 18, some of us in the Program went into town to get haircuts. We stopped at F. L. 's barbershop on Witherspoon Street.

Our group was part white and part Negro. When we went into the shop. F. told the Negro boys that he did not have the right kind of clippers to cut their hair. He explained that their hair was wiry and would hurt his blades. He suggested that they go down the street to a colored barbershop.

The group went to the Nassau Barbershop nearby. The same clippers that were used for white customers were also used for the Negro boys in our group.

On the following Saturday, July 25, a similar incident occurred at F. 's. Two Negroes in the Program were asked to leave the shop because they did not have an appointment.

F. said that he was booked until the following Wednesday. T. A., a local white boy in the Program, who was in the shop at the time, offered his place to one of the Negro boys. F. said, We don't work that way. '

The Director of the Summer Studies Program on campus witnessed the incident while he was getting a haircut. He had no appointment. Later, the Coordinator of the Princeton Summer Studies Program and C. N., a Negro counselor, went to F. shop because they were concerned about the incident. C. was refused a haircut. When he asked for a shave, F. told him that he does not give shaves to his customers. C. then asked if it was because he was black.

We think so. From the evidence we are certain that F. is guilty of discrimination against Negroes, and we are disgusted. We still don't believe it could happen here in a New Jersey city in 1964, especially Princeton. Princetonians are said to be proud of their town and the University, but do they really know all the facts? We believe that injustices such as these should be acted upon, and we are writing to your paper for results. All residents of Princeton should be aware of this problem, and, we hope, act against it.

[signed by four students]

Editor's Note: 'I honestly do not know how to cut Negroes' hair,' said F. L., owner of the barbershop, in commenting on the letter. He says that he did not refuse to cut the boys' hair, but merely told them that he did not know how and did not have the special tools which he had been told were necessary. 'It isn't that I'm against them,' said Mr. L., 'but because I don't know how to do the cutting, it would take me longer, and my white customers would have to wait and they might get tired of waiting and go somewhere else.'

From a news story in another local newspaper:

Barbers were warned Wednesday that they face the loss of their licenses for refusing service to Negroes or any other customers.

Some barbers have refused to serve non-whites, claiming that they do not know how to cut their hair. This excuse will not be accepted said Frank Marchese, Secretary of the State Board of Barber Examiners, in a letter to licensees. 'All persons licensed by the Board have the basic knowledge of how to shave and cut the hair of all races,' said the letter. 'Although some barbers who have not shaved or cut the hair of non-whites during their apprenticeship might not be as skillful with the first few non-white customers as they would be after more experiences, they could and should render such services when requested.'

Claims that a Princeton barber recently refused to cut a Negro's hair were made by a small group of students, who said they were participating in summer studies at Princeton University.

Circumstances of the alleged racial discrimination were made in a letter addressed to Princeton newspapers. [This paper] did not print the letter on the basis that the charges should be made first to proper official channels. The barber had contended that he did not know how to cut a Negro's hair, according to the students.

From a letter which President Goheen sent to the barber:

Your refusal to cut the hair of Negro students on two occasions within the past week is, I feel, an affront to both them and to the Princeton community generally.

No one of course can compel you to serve customers you choose not to serve, but surely the day has passed when such refusals can in decency be made -- or accepted -- because of the color of a person's skin or the texture of his hair.

My concern and sense of shame over these instances of discrimination in your shop no doubt are heightened because the students affected fall under my charge for this summer. Beyond this, as I have sought to make emphatically clear, Princeton University is committed to fair and equal treatment for all persons regardless of color or creed, and this sense of commitment carries with it a determination to help achieve the fullest possible measure of fair and open opportunity in this community of which we are part.

From a letter which the Mayor of Princeton Borough sent to a counselor:

Thank you for your letter of August 1st.

I have asked the owners of every barbershop in Princeton Borough to meet with me on Tuesday. At that time, I will tell these gentlemen that the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Princeton are of the opinion that they have the moral, if not legal, obligation to serve customers regardless of their race or color and if they are not willing to accept this obligation, the Borough will help them to go out of business. I am confident that a face-to-face meeting of this type will eliminate future unpleasant incidents of the type outlined in your letter. Incidentally, I have been in touch with PAHR and they are aware of my plans to meet with the barbers.

I am also aware of the position taken by the State of New Jersey to the effect that a barber, if he does not know how to cut a certain type of hair, is not entitled to be a licensed barber.

I know that you and I hope that the students involved will not judge Princeton on the basis of the actions of a few. We in the town have never judged Princeton University and its students on the basis of the many irresponsible acts of individual students or even the collective infamous act of a great many students such as occurred during the riot which you mentioned in your letter.

We are proud of our Town and we will do everything possible to make it better and better.

*

From a letter which was sent to the students by the community organization Princeton Association for Human Rights (PAHR):

I have been asked to write you on behalf of the members of the Princeton Association for Human Rights in order to express our shame at the discrimination that members of the Princeton Summer Studies Program encountered in our town and our admiration for the spirit with which the entire group responded to this manifestation of bigotry.

Those members of the Princeton Association for Human Rights who were fortunate enough to meet with the PSSP students on 7/30/64 were heartened by the attitudes of the students and we know that they will fight bigotry in their own communities. However, we wish to say that by investigating the matter so carefully and by writing such an excellent letter to the local press, they have already made an important contribution in the continuing struggle for racial justice in our community.

The Princeton Association for Human Rights plans to follow up this case and to take whatever action -- from continued testing to legal, economic and other sanctions -- as seem best designed to alter the policy of discrimination in F.'s Barbershop.

The restrained prose of these communications conceal the passions which the incident aroused in both students and staff and its role in creating solidarity and morale. The action of the students in asserting their rights is surely among the more important lessons in citizenship that they will learn in the course of their schooling. The vigorous steps taken by the University and community may also have taught them that society, adults, and whites do not always betray.

The problems which beset Negro youth will not always be so dramatic, nor so easily resolved. The subtle and difficult problems of identity confronted the PSSP students and staff, as they do Negroes everywhere in the United States. They must adjust their striving to a series of alternatives which may be crudely defined in classic terms of the "melting pot" versus cultural pluralism. For some, the answer is "integration," that is the total disappearance of a distinctive Negro identity; others assert that the solution is the maintenance of black separatism. Perhaps most struggle for a definition which would avoid confusing the achievement of the amenities of life on an equal basis with total submergence to the dominant culture.

These themes appeared in microcosm in the PSSP. Some of the students, for example, seemed to be self-conscious about associating primarily with fellow Negroes, as if this pattern was somehow a transgression against the ideal of civil rights. It is clear that, beyond the problems of securing legal recognition of first-class citizenship and the economic wherewithal to make it worthwhile, the Negro is also faced with the anguished dilemma of how to live as both a Negro and a man.

The Program

The actual program of the PSSP may be conveniently described under the rubric of 1) academic program and 2) extracurricular activities. There is reason to believe that the latter was no less significant than the more formal and structured efforts to induce change.

The Academic Dimension

The PSSP academic program was organized around four major areas: language and literature; science; sculpture and art; and speech.

The class schedule was as follows:

Day	Time 8:15-9:30	10:00-11:30	12-1	1:15-2:45
Monday	Science (2)	Language & Literature (3)	L	Sculpture & Art (2)
Tuesday	Science (2)	Language & Literature (3)	U	C.P., C.W. & O.I. (1)*
Wednesday	Science (2)	Speech (1)	N	Speech (1)
Thursday	Science (2)	Language & Literature (3)	C	Sculpture & Art (2)
Friday	Science (2)	Language & Literature (3)	H	C.P., C.W. & O.I. (1)

(1) The numbers in parentheses represent the number of classes being held during the respective hours for the subject course.

* C.P. = City Problems; C.W. = Creative Writing; O.I. = Oral Interpretation. Classes were conducted for three groups of students by three different instructors, the same three who conducted Language and Literature classes.

There were two Science teachers, one Speech teacher, and one each for Sculpture and Art.

The intent and spirit of the curriculum is described by Holland:

> Part of the plan had been to free students and faculty alike from ordinary academic routines, notably from such machinery as examinations and grading, in the effort to give free play to intellectual effort, the development of independent critical thought, the excitements of reading and discussion or the experience of painting and sculpture, and the fascination of scientific inquiry. Accordingly, no courses were simply transplanted from either high school or college curricula. The Science course was an excep-

tion to this, since it had already been worked out, packaged, and school-tested, but that course too had been designed originally to break away from usual secondary-school objectives and routines, and it is still being experimented with.

Three different courses in literature were half-planned, half-improvised on the spot, a separate course for each of three groups of thirteen students. A required class in sculpture became two classes, one in drawing and one in sculpture, once Mrs. Joseph Brown had teamed up with her husband in the arts program. In addition to Mr. James Murphy's required weekly class in public speaking, which had been originally scheduled, a course called "Oral Interpretation of Literature" began for some students in the second week under the direction of Mr. James Smoot of the State University of New York. Also in the second week, a course in creative writing was begun for another group by Mr. William Meredity of Connecticut College, and an American Civilization course called "City Problems" was launched for a third group.

They were taught in classes of twenty in Science, but each class was split into groups of about six for study and experiment around a small table. In Literature and in the afternoon courses there were classes of 13, seated around seminar tables in the newly refurbished (and tardily air-conditioned) basement rooms of McCosh. The teacher's attention was focused on a relatively small number of students for the entire six weeks and on an even smaller number for each hour-and-a-half session. Correspondingly the student was exposed from close at hand to the teacher. If a hesitant and taciturn student made an infrequent contribution to the discussion, it was physically possible for the teacher to hear him, respond, and put the student's perception to use. If one student began to develop an idea at length -- or if the teacher concentrated for a while on one particular student -- it was possible to do this without losing the rest of the group, for the pressure of attention was to some extent self-sustaining. The process of learning as a group was stressed by the instructors, and the students seemed to have a vested interest in the classroom work. Even those who seldom took an active part in the discussion remained engaged and learned by listening.

What they were exposed to, if not indeed taught, was intended to be challenging in the ways in which the best programs in schools and colleges are challenging. (One very able student, after proudly describing his freshman English course in high school which included Hardy's The Return of the Native and Conrad's Lord Jim in their entirety, said that it was "difficult but we

liked it.") The Science course, using no text and providing the student with a kit of materials instead, plunged directly into abstractions, problems of language, and problems of observation; it centered on the science of measurement in related areas of geology, astronomy, physics, and math, and wound up with the task of measuring the age and size of the Grand Canyon. When Miss Shirley Blum or Mr. David Oswald (of Princeton's Secondary School Science Project) told the students early in the game to "find your own answers," the students drew the crucial inference: you are learning, as one student aptly put it, "to teach yourself by the use of the teacher."

In the reading courses, too, the students were unsettled but stimulated by being put on their own and given challenging reading. One teacher told them that what they learned from him was less important than their own commitment to learning; another surprised them by saying that in fact he expected to learn from them; another startled them by warning them not to accept unquestioningly whatever teachers say because, with their techniques of exaggeration, teachers can be great liars. Students not only had to write often (twice a week or more, and the writing of many improved), but were asked to read their papers to the group and on occasion take charge of discussion. Two students who had read Edward Albee's "crazy" play, The Zoo Story, in Literature early in the summer found themselves giving a reading performance of an abbreviated version to an audience of students, faculty, and parents at the end of the term. Before the same audience one decidedly able student who has been in the North for little more than a year (his parents have been sending their children North, when they reach high school age, for over a decade, and he had told his Public Speaking class earlier that he could even "feel lonely in Grand Central Station") steeled himself for a most effective reading of a selection from James Baldwin's The Fire Next Time.

Readings were selected which would challenge the students' intellectual habits and provoke critical thought and probing scrutiny, while revealing issues and experience which were recognizably relevant to their lives. Students claimed they were digging deeper than before into poems (by Robert Frost, Gregory Corso, W. H. Auden, and Richard Wilbur among others) and making new discoveries about Julius Caesar; they puzzled over the grotesque horror of Flannery O'Connor's "A Good Man is Hard to Find," Shirley Jackson's "The Lottery," of Faulkner's "A Rose for Emily"; they followed the initiation of Sherwood Anderson's and Hemingway's young heroes into adult experience, looking for the deeper themes and implicit connections; they wrote papers on Conrad's

"An Anarchist," Melville's "Bartleby the Scrivener" and Billy Budd, and Twain's Huckleberry Finn. In City Problems they were introduced to reading of a kind unfamiliar to all of them -- professional scholarship and journalism on such subjects as poverty in America, racial prejudice, urban housing, architecture and city planning, and their discussions were informed and lively. When Mr. Michael Graves of Princeton's School of Architecture spoke to the group and called into question the American's devotion to the single-family house and yard, one fascinated student snapped back: "What's wrong with our side yards?"

The quality of the effort to engage students in intellectual activities relevant to their lives and the extent of the dedication to this principle that "students should be encouraged to think" may be illustrated by a more detailed description of a single offering "The Speech Course" which met once a week during morning and afternoon sessions. The following are representative activities and assignments:

1. During the first session students were required to select a card containing a question, furnish an answer, and give two reasons for the opinion expressed, all within a time limitation of two minutes. Examples of the questions include: Why do I like my best friend? Where would I like to live? What sport do I like best? How does it feel to be lonely? Is it better to be rich or happy? Who would I like to be? What do I hate to do the most?

2. The students were asked to read a statement or to speak extemporaneously on a subject of their own choosing. They selected such topics as athletics, freedom of speech, science and religion, electronics, being taught to see, the value of PSSP, the cold and hot war, the American way, the preparation for the senior prom, why education is important, travel, birth control, death and life, education and intelligence, the role of the teenager in society, Ernest Hemingway, hate: is it jealousy?, Latin America, and juvenile delinquency and environment.

3. "The Republican National Convention is now meeting in San Francisco to nominate a candidate for President and another for Vice-President. It is being televised on almost every channel. Your assignment is to watch at least fifteen minutes of the Convention and to write 150-word criticism of one of the speakers you see. This criticism should contain at least the following: name of the speaker you saw, one paragraph describing his (or her) good points as a speaker, one paragraph describing his (or her) faults as a speaker, and one paragraph giving your opinion as to whether he (or she) is a good speaker."

4. This weekend the Republican Party will have picked its candidate for President. You will deliver a prepared speech (two minutes) explaining why you think the candidate will, or will not, win in November. (Reading recommended: New York Times, in Firestone Library reference room; Newsweek magazine, Time magazine.)

5. The class was divided into three groups, each consisting of a chairman and seven participants. The remaining students were charged with the responsibility of observing and rating the ensuing discussion. The subjects selected by the students were: Who is responsible for conduct on a date -- the boy or the girl; police brutality; the Supreme Court's decision on prayer in the public schools.

6. The final assignment required the students to evaluate the PSSP.

The criteria by which the students were rated is outlined in the following evaluation form:

Speech content and delivery Name_____ Date _____
Speech subject _____ Grade 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Content

1. Main ideas used:
2. Use of forms of support:
   A. For clarity: Explanation
      Analogy
      Illustration
      Specific Instance
   B. For proof: Statistics
      Testimony
      Restatement
3. Reasoning:
4. Arrangement of Ideas: Introduction
   Body
   Conclusion
5. Language Used:
6. Remarks on Content: _____
   _____

Delivery

1. Eye Contact with Audience:
2. Attitude toward Audience:
3. Arms and Hands:
4. Posture and Movement:
5. Voice Variety: Rate
   Pitch
   Force

The general reaction to this course, as reported by selected students, was favorable. In referring to the final session, one student wrote:

> Every speaker was natural. In other words, they did not speak from their notes but from their hearts, really feeling their speeches. Most of us agreed that if we could not stand at the podium and speak on what we felt the meaning of the program was without notes, then the program did not really hold too much meaning for us. Every speech, however, was wonderful. It usually started out as a calm complimentary [talk], then gradually developed into an emotional critique, simply great!

Two students indicated that the "the opportunity to speak publicly" has encouraged them to want to run for an office in their school association. Another said that "the Speech class taught me not to be afraid -- to overcome stage fright -- to be calm." Still another hinted at the therapeutic value of the Speech class:

> [It] gave me a chance to get these feelings out of me. Because I can't go up before a large audience and speak on anything. Today someone asked me if I had prepared a speech and I said no because the reason why I feel -- I can read a speech. But that's nothing. I can read offhand but it you can come up here in front of the audience without any notes it's a lot better, and if somebody asked me a question and I didn't have any notes on it, I'd just have to answer them.

Extracurricular Activities

The PSSP offered the students the opportunity to engage in the quasi-formal recreational activities which are now staples in most educational programs. These proved to diverting but not crucial to the students' achievements and reactions. Certain other experiences, such as speeches delivered by President Goheen and Bill Bradley, Princeton's nonpareil basketball player, confirmed the administration's concern for the Program and the welfare of the students, and undoubtedly contributed to their morale. However, of all the extracurricular activities, by far the most important for learning and attitude formation were those that may be classified under the categories of "enrichment" and "informal social organization."

The first of these refers to efforts through field trips and other means to expand the universe with which the students have some contact. In response to Mr. Wilcox's request, one faculty mem-

ber who accompanied the students to a New York performance of Martin Duberman's In White America, offered a perceptive account of the experience:

> You asked for a report of this trip. At first glance it would seem easy enough to report. Yet, under the surface, it was an experience filled with "involvement," "enrichment," "group dynamics," and any other term you would care to use. As far as the mechanics of the trip are concerned, it was well run. (My criteria? We didn't lose anyone!)
>
> Well, let's just plunge in and begin almost anywhere. Before getting into the playhouse, I imagine some of the boys were wondering why they had said they would come. They admitted later they thought it might be boring.
>
> Up to this time though, even the subway rides were an experience. C. C. was convinced the doors would close on him before he was either in or out. So we all suggested tranquilizers and laughed with him. We traveled in smaller groups and also ate in these groups. J. H. and I were alone in a booth in the restaurant -- "segregated"? At this point J. H. brought up the barbershop incident to me and told me all about it. I remarked that we might both be squirming before the play was over -- and he agreed. We also talked about the "Casuals," etc. I brought up the topic by asking J. if he was a "Night Raider." He said no, he was still an independent but he might join the "Defenders" this week. When asked why this choice he said he liked them because they only wanted to defend their own floor and not go around goofing up the other floors.
>
> In the playhouse, some of the boys had front row seats which appealed to them, although the theater is so small anyone could feel part of a front row. After the play started, the "magic" of the evening began. It held the boys spellbound. They were an excellent audience, polite and attentive -- although I am sure they would have been, at least this much, had the play been dull. But they showed an appreciation of humor, pathos, and tragedy as portrayed on the stage. They were impressed by the quality of acting, most intuitively recognizing excellence when they saw it, and also as the result of some of their work this summer in their English and Language classes. At the intermission the talk was of how great it was, and those in the front row held forth on how sure they were the anger of the actor was going to result in the chair hitting them. (They almost reminded me of men in a war front line!) "Man, I really jumped when he shouted!" "I ducked -- it was so real."

After it was over and we took our wrung-out selves out onto the street, the real "meat" of the evening began as the boys started to react to the play. The dressingroom of the men actors opened right onto the sidewalk and they graciously gave the boys a great deal of time. This time and attention was used wisely and with obvious appreciation. They discussed acting, the play itself, the parts they had liked best, etc. Perhaps, it will do to just write some of the "quotable quotes" to help convey part of the spirit of the evening.

"I told the man who played Wilson [Woodrow] I just hated him!"
"You mean you really said that to him?"
"I bet he was pleased. That's a real compliment to his acting."
"It's just like Mr. Smoot said in Oral Interp . . . I mean, if a person feels the part costumes and scenery aren't needed -- he actually becomes that person to you."
"This is the best acting I ever saw."
"This is the best play I ever saw."
"It definitely belongs on Broadway!"
"No, I wouldn't want it on Broadway. Do you think we could ever talk to actors like this if it was in a big theater?"
"Could we meet the author?"
"That actress cried real tears. I almost did, too."
"Did you see all the ladies crying? Some of the men, too."
"Did you see, too, the big actor cry -- I mean really cry -- when he told about how he had practically been a slave again in 1948?"

I asked H. G. how he had liked it. (I understand H. G. is a man of few words and those few are never overly enthusiastic.) He said, soberly and sincerely, "It was really good." (High praise, I feel, from an intelligent, critical boy who never missed a word or movement throughout the whole thing.)

Another interesting incident . . . a "bum" approached the boys for money. They were very polite to him and had quite a chat. H. J. wanted to give him money. A counselor told him absolutely not to. H. J. was concerned. "My church says we should help people . . " He was really torn when it was pointed out that the fellow would just drink up the money and this was not the way to really help him.

We left for home only when the case had to begin a second show. There had been some talk earlier of walking around the Village for a while, but this idea was never mentioned again after the boys discovered the "Theater"!

V. C. had quite an evening. He was in another world with the play, the streets of New York, the contrasts he saw and recognized. He even looked at me with great amazement at one point in the evening and said, "You know, you have a terrific sense of humor!" So we discussed how teachers are people after all. To top it all off, he struck up a very interesting conversation on the bus home with a stranger, a white boy from New Brunswick and a high school student, who gave V. C. lots of good advice on the way to take college tests, how to prepare for them, and the best courses to take. They discussed everything from sports, school, the program at Princeton (which the boy said sounded great), and ended up with the racial issues and Harlem. Quote from V. C. at the end of the bus ride, "I feel just like a country boy who has really seen and learned a lot tonight." And I guess this is a good way to sum up the whole evening.

It is clear that forays away from the campus had a remarkable impact on the students. A more pervasive influence was the daily life of the participants as it was lived within the sanctuary of their dormitory. The dormitory was the students' private turf, it provided new opportunities to demonstrate self-reliance and furnished an arena for such delights as water fights and daring raids. It was also the place where students developed the personal and collective resources which moved them closer to their own purposes and those of the Program. As we shall see, educators would do well not to underestimate the creativity of students. The following excerpts from a long interview between Mr. Wilcox and a student illustrates the social control process -- how the students disciplined and assisted each other, the developing values of the student culture, and the incipient efforts of students to create a formal mechanism through which they could enter into negotiations with the administration.

Mr. Wilcox: Since you are sitting here, there is one other question I want to ask you. As you recall, you were the one who came to me about the fact that the group, by group I mean participating students, were forming informal organizations in order to stimulate greater cooperation and participation among all members of the student body. For instance, you talked about the fact that the students who were sleeping in class were being talked to be a committee of students. You also indicated someting about those students who might be playing around too much. Can you give me some insights how and when this whole idea started and who you think the leaders of the student body are?

Student: The idea of a featured club system started about a week and a half after we came down here. We got tired, I think, of the regular routine of going down at 9:30 to the meetings and having a snack and talking about the day. We needed something else to stimulate us beside study. So we decided to have this system. I feel that the coordinator of it was H. G. and Y. They got the thing on the ball. They started their own clubs and united as one, as the Casuals. Their purpose is just to have a little fun, maybe some raids once in a while just for kicks and nobody ever complains about the thing. As far as the part goes about when did certain things occur, well, the committee that was made up for seeing that people wouldn't sleep in class was myself, Y., W., and V., plus I forgot Z. We were picked because of our past reputation, in a way. Not that it was fear that we intended to use, but that sometimes you have to use force in order to comply with things. So, we rather that the group felt that we were the strongest in the sense physically, to take care of people that we wouldn't overcome mentally. So this is why were chosen the leaders. We have what is called a tutor. He doesn't teach and he doesn't try to help the student, but he sits in his room while the student prepares his homework. He merely sits on the bed without talking and watches the student, sometimes getting up and looking over his shoulder. One of these boys that we did this to was E. It took us about an hour and a half to get into his room. Once we finally got into his room we just stood up over him. He didn't complain. He didn't want to go tell his counselor because he knew what he faced. So he just sat down and did his homework. Pretty soon, after doing this enough, it became a regular thing. W. had a problem with doing his homework so V. and I visited his room one night. It's not that the boy didn't want to do his homework, it's that he couldn't compel himself to do [it], so by standing over him and knowing what he faced if he didn't do [it], he complied with it. And this sometimes you must use force, that is what I feel that parents are here for sometimes. Parents do make a child do homework, they're like his guardian angels. We made him do his homework, but now he does it regularly by himself. B., it happened to once. We used to have a little trouble down the hallway with W. N. He wrote his girls too many letters and by the time he finished, he didn't have time to do his homework. So we just did the same thing. I'd like to comment on that the fact that at none of these sessions that occurred at any of these times did we ever put to use what we were picked for -- our force. The only force that we ever used was force of fear more or less, but never with a physical force of touching them.

Mr. Wilcox: I said this a couple of times. Did you see anything that happened in the program that may have stimulated the students to see that they had to form their own informal organizations. In other words, you are suggesting that this just happened because they were getting bored at the 9:30 meetings. But did anything happen, an acute situation, that forced you to begin to think about the need for this type of informal organization?

Student: I can't think of an acute situation, but I will let you know what we propose to talk about tonight. It might prove to be interesting to you. Tonight we plan on writing a petition which will be signed by all forty boys, we hope, letting us . . . This petition will be proposed tonight. It will be written by myself. It will be signed by all forty members of the group. The petition will contain the fact that we propose that this organization send two counselors to each town with the group of boys that come from this town, just for about six or seven hours in one day, just for one day only. This is all we propose. After having a visitation day, most boys today felt the need to want to go back even I must use the thing of for the girlfriends. Because it is something that I never really understood -- grown-ups cry that we are too young to feel for a person, but I feel that feelings start when they start. It doesn't go by age limit. Some boys are a little bit homesick for their parents. And I know that the parents are a little bitwanting of their sons. So this will be proposed tonight. We know it won't be passed, but just the fact that we have the right to propose it, makes us think we are something big.

Mr. Wilcox: As you know, this is a confidential communication. I will not share with anyone the source of this information. By anyone, I mean none of the counselors. The only people who will know of it is the person who types it and maybe the Program Coordinator. If it is ever reproduced, the names will be changed and even the "source" will be changed. However, I will always be indebted to you for your cooperation. The reason I am saying all of this now is that I wouldn't be surprised if your petition was honored. Now, I am saying this to you because you have cooperated with me and I want to give you some feeling of the administration's concern for the kids. I think it's genuine and I would not be surprised if the petition passed. I hope, however, that you will not share this information with any of the kids because, indeed, the petition might not be approved for some sound reason and you will have encouraged the kids to think that it would be approved.

Just again, I know that I am pushing this question, but I'd like to ask you again -- at this point a week and a half ago when the clubs began to form, there must have been some incident around which caused the groups to want to form some type of informal group. In other words, your suggestion that there might have been an accumulation of boredom around the 9:30 meetings. What was the precipitating incident? What was that toothache or the backache or the stomach ache that made you feel that you had to go to a doctor?

Student: Well, I guess you want honesty. I didn't want to bring this out. We promised never to reveal it, but since this is confidential, I will reveal it.

Mr. Wilcox: If the group asked it not to be revealed and you feel uncomfortable about revealing it, I would recommend that you not do so. Because I want you to feel comfortable with your boys, don't forget.

Student: I'll feel comfortable with my boys, but the fact is that we never like to talk about any one person on the administrative staff because they're being so helpful. But, we do feel, I think I can tell it this way without using names, there was an incident in 1941 Hall that occurred about the time that the club idea hadn't arisen yet. This is the incident that we feel pushed it towards becoming clubs. One night in the lounge there was an outburst made by one of the people who had control over the program sending all of the students upstairs for no particular reason whatsoever. Even though this person apologized about two days later, publicly, in one of our meetings, it still gave the kids that night the feeling of "what happened to him" you know. And it gave a couple of the ones, the extremists in our group, the feeling of, well, man, we don't have to be down here, you know, we can go back home, you know, and stuff like that. After this outburst, a couple of us talked in the room. This was when it was decided that we should have a committee that should tell the program the things that we like and the things that we dislike. What we want done and how we want it did, and so on. And this is how I really feel that the clubs was started. I know they coincided so closely together and this is why I feel that this was started like this. In reference that we met that night, when this incident occurred, immediately after that we met. The room we met in was 221. The people that were there were Y., V., E., C., W., Z., T. M., A. T., and B. I know that I've excluded a few people. We met in my room. We talked about what had happened, but not at that time did we, but no one was talking about the club. But after we

had brought down the discussion on the floor about what had happened, we decided that we should have a committee, not a club, but a committee, to you know, ask the administration questions, and question them and tell them what we want and so on like that. Being that the club, I mean that the committee was named Casual for some reason, that's because we came in our pajamas which we felt would be the casual way [and] so on like that, we named it Casuals. And these little other groups sprung up. But the Casual really is a committee, a speaking committee of the group that is supposed to be connected with the administration body.

Mr. Wilcox: This is getting more interesting by the moment. What you are really saying is that the Casuals, whose name derived from the fact that they were wearing pajamas at the time they had a discussion, that is, they were wearing casual wear. This group is essentially the executive committee of the student body. And the Night Raiders and the Defenders are more of the club type groups.

Student: The Night Raider idea was brought up by myself, let's put it that way. I had the idea that we could enter the rooms at night and put all books and things on top of the bed without hurting the person. When he woke up in the morning he'd say, you know, well, what the hell happened during the night, you know. The way we did it, there was two ways of doing it. I guess I can reveal the ways, since this group is not in existence any more. We went down to Mrs. P. and said that we locked ourselves out of our rooms. She gave us the passkey. Then we took the passkey, opened the doors and went in and did things like that. Some nights we couldn't keep on doing this continuously every night so we had a system. Right before the person went to bed, one Night Raider was in there, the other one was pushing off the button latch which was on the door and then the person would usually ask him to close the door on the way out and make sure it's locked and we said, "O. K.," and we'd close the door, but taking off the lock. Around 12 or 1 o'clock, we would slip into the room and put everything on the bed. You see how it was done like that.

As for the rest of the little groups, they tried to give competition, they tried to copy the Casuals and the Night Raiders. One group was called the Coup d'Etat which was G. and F. in the group. They were the only two members. They were the President and the Vice-President and the Secretary and Treasurer and so on. Their idea was to leave well enough alone, not to bother any clubs, but just don't come into their territory which the Casuals and the Night Raiders were very much against. This club was soon dissolved for lack of fear.

In reference to what I said, we stopped messing with this Coup d'Etat group because since they didn't fear us, we just left them alone and this is what the clubs thrive on is the fear or the playful fear that we instill into these other people that are not in groups.

The Defenders which are composed of students as well as counselors is the group that defends its floor; just its floor and its floor only. It is not a dormitory-wide group. The counselors are in it also. C. C. and B. are the head of the Defenders on my floor which is the second entry, second floor, and so on like that which the third entry, second floor, and so on like that.

The last group was the upcoming Ebbtides which B. T. or E. C. was the head of who are negotiating now, every night, at 9:30 about certain laws that are being passed, you know. We bow to the laws of the administration plus the laws we set down ourselves, making it a challenge to stay within the law. The Ebbtides went like this and the Ebbtides and the Casuals are the two big clubs in the dormitory. As I said before any time something has to be proposed like this petition that we will give to the Program Coordinator tomorrow, it is proposed by the Casuals, usually with myself and Y. at the head of it. Myself at the head because I type and put it in fancy words so that it looks presentable. Y. signs it and so on like that. I sign it also.

The Ebbtides are E. C., T. M., and A. F. and a whole lot of boys that are against the Casuals because the Casuals set a certain limit as to how many boys they would take in. The Casuals are W. H., A. D. and boys of this nature. I am in neither one. I am more or less the negotiator for both groups. I feel I just didn't want to get in one. I just want to stay neutral and just go between both groups, but when the Casuals are effective in trying to get a point across to the administration, I'm then placed at the head of it, but as for going on these night raids and things like that, I don't participate -- I participate in them, but I'm not a member of the organization.

In regards to the Ebbtides, this is a group which is coming up which the counselors have no acknowledgment about or anyone else that does not go to the 9:30 negotiations of the Casuals and the Ebbtides. We do keep records which we will at the end of the program show to the counselors after these Ebbtides come into existence which they will do one week before the program is over with. This is the second week of August. The point as to why it will come in the last week of August is because we plan to do something we never did before. We have to take our coun-

selors who we feel they have an extremely good sense of humor and have a night raid on them. This will be pulled by the Ebb-tides so that when they come around in the morning and say and ask if the Casuals did it, they can truthfully say no, the Casuals did not do it, without lying.

Some Consequences of the Program: For the Students

The purpose of all education is change. It is undertaken on the assumption that growth on the part of students is both possible and desirable in one or all of the following areas: knowledge, skills, values, and personality. This section will indicate the nature of some of the educational changes influenced by the PSSP as they were perceived by the actors most involved -- the faculty, parents, and the students themselves. The evidence here, as in the remainder of this report, is impressionistic but in some instances it is partially derived from written instruments.

According to the Faculty

According to the testimony of the faculty, sixteen of the students, or 40 per cent, revealed "noticeable improvement" in at least one course. White students were disproportionately represented within this group, as were those with higher I. Q. s. It is interesting to note, as with other adolescent school groups, only one of the "noticeable improvement" contingent achieved high status within the student body. None of them were elected as student officers or accepted as leaders in informal organizations.

The specification of as many as sixteen students who exhibited notable growth is all the more remarkable in view of the brief period of the Program. It is perhaps more revealing that a larger number of students showed encouraging tendencies toward achieving desirable outcomes. At various points during the summer, the faculty was willing to employ the collective "they" in reporting certain general changes. Comments by two of the teachers, one in Science, the other in Literature, will illustrate the type of skills sought, and in a gratifying number of instances achieved. The progress in Science was apparently more dramatic.

> They seemed to enjoy the idea of how to think, how to use their own capability. They're willing to be challenged; they're willing to challenge me, and they don't seem to view me as an authority, image or otherwise. This doesn't stop them from disagreeing with me anyway . . . When they first came in, they were concerned with giving the right answer. In drawing upon their amusing vocabulary, they would show that they had been

in contact with -- they knew about atoms and they knew about molecules. They knew about certain terms in geology; they knew about certain astronomical terms when we observed the moon; they could throw around some of the lingo a little bit. They had been in Science classes and they had some information; they had some knowledge. They were not used to the idea of a teacher saying, "Well, I'm not really sure about it; I don't know. You tell me what you think about it . . ." They can really realize when they kind of out of line maybe in thinking or I can challenge them and say, "that's okay so far, but you know, take it the next step no . . . I think you can go one step further," and others are willing to sit in class and listen and wait while someone thinks. When the rest of them want to answer, you can say to them, "No, no, I don't want to hear from you, let him keep on thinking, he's almost got it," and they are perfectly willing to wait for this process to develop, and I would say that they have been perfectly willing to give up their preconceived notion that I wanted right answers, because very often we don't care about right answers as such, we want to know if they can develop a way of looking at things and that we aren't learning facts, but we are learning approaches to things.

I'm not really certain that I know what learning patterns they brought with them. Not having observed them in study situations, I'm not at all sure how they went about doing their work. I have an impression that in the beginning there was some concern about doing the work and a genuine effort to follow my advice on reading and answering the study questions that I had given them for each short story or poem. I have the impression that after a couple of weeks the concentration diminished and that the amount of time spent on assignments also diminished. I'm pretty certain that in the beginning their reading of stories was quite superficial and I got the impression that this comes from having learned that the main thing that was to be given back to the teacher was characters, a very simple look at the plot and maybe a look at the more obvious implications of the reading. There was definite growth in the ability to look behind the material on the part of some of the students.

According to the Parents

About half of the parents answered an inquiry addressed to them at the conclusion of the Program on the nature of the changes they observed in their children. Their responses were often extraordinarily revealing. Most reported "positive" movement, but even

"negative" evaluations, which focused on such terms as "too independent" or "too little communication" are not altogether distressing. For example:

> Somehow he seems to be in another world, also his attitude has been changing for some time, he seems to resent us because we do not always agree to his way of thinking and doing.

or

> He argues with his father and myself all the time. A good example of this came at the dinner table the first week after the program ended. He brought up the question, "Daddy, did God make man or did man make God?" I was stunned by a question like this. I knew if I could have asked my parents a question like that I would have been under the table. We argued a long time. His points were good and he had a basis for everything he said. He told us the first day he came back from the program that people should have a basis for everything they say.

or

> But he has also become very vain and likes to argue with me about certain things but doesn't get off hand. I am pleased with the changes.

The most complete letter regarding "positive" changes is, in a sense, a summary of the individual replies of all of the parents:

> First, we are very happy that R. was one of the chosen one's to participate in this wonderful program. It has been a valuable asset to him and to us.
>
> We have notice the following changes in R. 1) Better study habits. 2) Seems to be more confident in what he is doing. 3) Better Conversation in expressing his opinion about issues concerning himself and others. 4) He wants facts and not assumptions. 5) Has decided what he wants to become. 6) A little too independent at times. 7) He has become more concious of the fact that it is very important to learn all that is possible and try to take advantage of all the opportunities. 8) The real value of spending and saving money. 9) How to budget his time.

According to the Students

There is some suggestive, objective evidence tending to support the favorable judgments of faculty and parents, for example:

1. Out of a total of 158 academic grades earned by these students during the subsequent fall semester of 1964 in their own

schools, 27 per cent were "A's," 45 per cent were "B's," 20 per cent were "C's," 6 per cent were "D's," and 1 per cent were "F's." Full information as to their grades prior to their entrance into the PSSP is not available, but it is likely that their later performance represents an improvement.

2. When they returned to their respective high schools, 29 of the participating students joined, and in many instances assumed leadership, in the total of 34 school and community organizations.

3. Nearly 40 per cent planned and presumably engaged in broader educational activities during the summer of 1965, including further schooling at Andover and Exeter Academies and participation in the Outward Bound and Friends Service Committee programs.

It is even more significant that a survey conducted on their goals after the completion of the Program revealed a variety of lively and useful private and social aims. To be sure, many of the responses were stereotyped and routinely virtuous, but a substantial number were concrete and specific. For example, one student reported:

> I will offer tutoring services to younger children, find solutions to bring drop-outs back to school, and help teenagers kick the habit of smoking and drinking . . . I am going to start a singing group around our neighborhood and make some reforms in our school if I get into the Student Council again; [this student was subsequently elected Vice-President of his class] I'll attempt to cast an influential shadow which my friends will admire and respect.

A Puerto Rican student wrote:

> I will try to organize a group or club for fellows my own age who are interested in their culture and we will go on field trips, etc.

Two Negro students alluded to this notion when they wrote "I want to try to begin a petite NAACP in my town," and "through my affiliation with the NAACP I shall strive to contribute all the assistance that I can to foster a better relation between the whites and Negroes in this community."

A final question in the follow-up survey was phrased as follows:

> Now that you have set goals for the coming year, in what ways does your PSSP experience contribute to these goals? What makes you feel you can achieve them?

Student responses may be grouped according to four major themes: 1) social expectations and personal responsibility; 2) self-confidence and self-expression; 3) the value of education; 4) academic skills.

The following are some illustrations of the social expectations and personal responsibility theme:

> It has given me prestige and a feeling of responsibility.
>
> The program has made me think that there [is] a great expectation for me and I hope the extra expectations will be the thing that is needed for me to think more seriously about my future.
>
> My experience . . . has taught me to be self-reliant, to make a schedule for myself, it has given me a reason to study, namely to enter college; to be responsible, honest, and many other enlightening characteristics . . . there is much pressure on me now, as you know, and if I fail, I not only fail myself, but many, many other people who are seriously interested in me. I don't want that on my conscience.

The following are some illustrations of the self-confidence and self-expression theme:

> I have confidence in myself.
>
> I also got something I [feel] most important, the understanding of my abilities and opportunities . . . I trust the opinion of the above people [instructors, counselors, and Mr. Wilcox] and with their faith in me and the faith that they gave me in myself . .
>
> I obtained a deeper realization of how confidence is so much more important. I realized my confidence has become stronger in myself due to my stay in Princeton.
>
> From PSSP I learned not to hold back my ideas and to tell them to my friends. I have confidence in myself which I didn't have when I first went there.

The following are some illustrations of the value of education theme:

> This program didn't make me say I'm going to work hard this year. But it did make me say, there's a lot I don't know and a lot I want to know. Now it's up to me to decide whether these things are worth going out for.
>
> I got a preview of campus life that will prepare me for the future. The PSSP shows me in full the need for a college education.

> But the main thing it did for me was to let me know now what life was and how a life should be lived, and that's through education.

The following are some of the illustrations of the academic skills theme:

> I learned the basic tools of reading and writing.
>
> My comprehension and reasoning have been enriched.
>
> I developed good study habits.

It is clear on the basis of fragmentary, objective evidence and the testimony of the participants, and those who observed them, that something of consequence occurred and in directions that are mostly desirable. We have not attempted to translate these results into quantitative form, but we are persuaded even "one" is a number of enormous significance.

Some Additional Consequences of the Program

In an interim report on the PSSP, written in 1965, the Program Director correctly pointed out that

> There are hundreds of individual anecdotes and events to illustrate what is happening to individual boys; but the energy, time, and money expended in their names must be finally justified on the effect that the PCSP has on others.

The Director goes on to list some seven points which bear repetition here:

1. We have served as a model for the Princeton-Trenton Institute which centered on Trenton public school teachers and 150 Trenton youths in a successful non-residential program.
2. We have served as a model for William Meredith's residential program for high school girls at Connecticut College for Women. This, I gather from personal observation and second-hand reports, was a success even unto the survival by Professor Meredity of the stresses generated by 40 teen-agers of the gentler sex.
3. We have demonstrated that the Princeton undergraduate and recent graduate is an effective classroom teacher. We have provided an "experimental school" in which they were "practice teachers."

4. We have demonstrated that Princeton can "reach" the "central city youth," which is something that few, either on this campus or in the public school systems, thought could happen.

5. We have begun to make some positive impressions on the schools. Our best marks there are in the trust that has been building up and in the disappearance of some of the original hostilities. I think by deed and action we have demonstrated to the schools that we are sincere in our intent and effective in our program. As a result we have an ever strengthening position from which PCSP or any future program can operate.

6. We are leaving an effect on a number of organizations interested in these types of boys and the problems they represent. Some examples: The American Friends Service has included several of our students in their programs and found them impressive to the point that AFS now seeks our advice in finding this type of boy, a type they had been unable to reach previously. Essexfields Rehabilitation Center in Newark is now beginning to inaugurate "internships" based on its experience with one of our 1964 students who worked at Essexfields this summer. United Progress Inc., Trenton's anti-poverty organization, has asked some of our students to work with it in local leadership positions. The Howard Savings Bank of Newark which helped us with the costs of Outward Bound, continues to be actively interested in making this experience available to Newark youths. There are others, but the point is that we have some "rippling" effect beyond our individual student.

7. We have demonstrated that boys can be transferred from "central city" to the "greenhouse" of Princeton and profit. More important we have shown that these same boys can go back into their original environment and take with them new hope and confidence and maintain them where it is most vital that they be maintained. I think that we have gambled that this would happen, and so far we have won. The possibility that excellence of education (as represented by Princeton) and problems of the urban center (as represented by our PCSP students) can be brought in direct contact to mutual benefit is perhaps the single most important fact that has emerged in the last two years.

Discussion

The foregoing sections have recorded some intended and unintended consequences of the PSSP. The method of study has been crude but we feel certain that the benefits derived were worth the effort. There is gratifying evidence of increased skills, heightened motivations, and deepened insights of the sort which bode well for the future of both the boys and society. It may be helpful to engage in some preliminary speculation into some of the determinants of positive change.

As always the boys themselves are probably the most reliable witnesses. As we mentioned earlier at the conclusion of the program they were asked to indicate what was the "most meaningful event" which they experienced while at Princeton. Their opinions group themselves in rank order as 1) relationships established with their teachers, 2) the method of teaching, 3) the role of the college undergraduates, 4) the course content, and 5) their relationships with other students.

One student appended a remarkable 15-page report which, because of its insight, is worthy of extensive citation:

> Mr. M. was the most 'interested' English teacher that I had ever met. I suppose being a dedicated poet furthered his desire to listen, study, and evaluate the ideas of his students. When I spoke in class, I did not really speak to my fellow students; I spoke to him. I knew if there was any meaning in my suggestions, he would find this meaning, and in such a way that it encouraged me to put more meaning, more logic into my actions. I not only respect him as a fine English teacher, but as a close and helpful friend.
>
> I feel that the small amount of time I spent in discussing matters with J. J. was as worthwhile as the time spent with my assigned counselor. J. was very much like Mr. M., but because of his youth he was able to help me recognize values in my writing that I was unable to see with the aid of Mr. M. I am very grateful to him for this; I'm also glad to say that J. understands me a little better than when we first met. Next year I hope to strengthen this understanding.
>
> My relationship with Mr. P. was also a valuable one. I have been an ardent tennis player for four years. I have played in several tournaments, winning and losing. My effort and concentration, however, were not quite up-to-par with my true ability -- as Mr. P. put it -- and he was right.

Through Mr. P.'s encouragement and guidance I learned 'control,' enabling me to win the tennis tournament at Princeton and to be enrolled in the United States Lawn Tennis Association. I am very grateful to Mr. P., not only for his guidance, but I feel through successfully helping me, the whole program has meant just a little bit more to him.

C. C. and I were close friends when we left Weequahic six weeks ago. We depended upon one another's companionship to help ease the tension of a new environment. After a while C. and I began to draw away from each other, following opposite paths. Paths, ideals would be a better word, for because of our ideals we refused to acknowledge the value of one another's beliefs. However, after a period of reluctant curiosity, we began to search and find some substance in both our ideals, once again drawing us together as friends. I feel that our relationship now is much stronger than before and I hope will last much longer.

I feel the first period Language-Literature course to be the most interesting part of my school day. I had always felt that English was a subject that I could probe deeply into. However, my intentions were good but the manner in which I went about probing was incorrect. I had always thought of English literature as a method by which I might express, through writing, the important experiences of my life; that is until I was introduced to the English course at Princeton. Thus, instead of analyzing a poem or short story for its simple impression, the idea that the author or poet gives you, I twisted its meaning trying to find a possible connection between the poem and an event in my life. Hence, I found discouragement so sharp that I almost yielded my desire to probe into literature for fear of another let-down.

The instructor at Princeton showed me the correct way of analyzing a poem. Taking this unit-of-impression and relating it to "what" the author was talking about, then to examine this relationship, to attempt to discover a different meaning, possibly by applying it to previous events in my life.

In order to show proof of my development of technique, I have written a series of critical essays. Unfortunately, I sent them to Princeton University, instead of your present address. They are probably at Wilcox Hall. I would be very grateful if you would give them your consideration and criticism.

The trip to New York was the most unforgettable of my traveling experiences. Now New York has always fascinated me with its may peculiar sights and sounds, this time was no exception. I

went to see one play, I saw two; In White America was a fascinating, realistic production of the plight of the American Negro. Ah, but the truly great play was New York City herself.

We ate dinner in Romeo's, a truly Italian restaurant; after dinner we walked through the streets sightseeing and trying to find our bearings. Then we saw him; he approached us uncertain at first, but gradually gaining confidence. It was a hot, muggy night, most of us had already removed our ties and jackets, but he seemed comfortable in a thick woolen sweater and cotton pants. His eyes rolled as he spoke, not one of us moved, transfixed by our individual awe of his manner. All he wanted was fifteen cents. Fifteen cents to further the ruin of his life. I had never seen a so-called wino before; I was horrified, all I wanted to do was get on the bus and head home. This was an act in the play New York City I had not anticipated.

C. N., my counselor, asked L. M., W. N., and myself to have dinner with friends of his. They were a wonderful couple; Dr. S. is a chemist and he joyfully answered all of our questions about his profession. Mrs. S. was a delightful woman and an excellent cook. That evening we dined on turkey roasted to a golden-brown with all the trimmings, three types of salads, string beans and a various assortment of dips. For dessert there were brownies. I guess she over-used some ingredients, as the brownies were very thick, but what is wrong with thick, chewy chocolate cake? After dinner, we visited Dr. S.'s laboratory, impressed, we watched as he operated his chemical 'utensils' and just missed a gaseous fire down the corridor in another laboratory. All in all it was a very worthwhile experience. Well, it certainly was satisfying to eat something other than the food of Commons and Wilcox Hall.

I really liked the various athletic programs set up by the counselors and tennis instructors. I only wish that every boy could have gotten the advantages of all of them. The swimming program was great, the instructors, who were our counselors, were really conscientious about their job. The fencing instruction was, I suppose, the one that required the most physical endurance. We may not get many good fencers from that course, but they are much better off physically than they were when they first started. I was really impressed by the tennis instruction. I was glad that form was so greatly emphasized. There were always people willing to practice and offer useful opinions. I really benefitted from the competition, as far as the athletic opportunities were concerned the program was a definite success.

Another prime reason for the success of the project was the amount of free time allowed to each person and what use we made of it.

It gave me a chance to browse around, to discover what secrets the university held. Night found me stalking Guyot Hall exploring the hideous museum rejects in the basement, to the shaky platform on the roof, which gave a very impressive view of the university.

This free time not only gave the fellows a chance to get acquainted with their environment but to get better acquainted with themselves. In order to gain a person's interest in various ideas, you must first find out what he is or is not interested in. A student of physics would probably not be elated by the idea of composing a one-hundred-and-fifty book bibliography on Negro history, whereas a pupil interested in civil rights would be. However, the combined experiences, knowledge of the counselors and other staff provided a wealth of ideas for us to work on.

I think the most meaningful event to all the boys was the barbershop incident. To most of us it was the first time we had ever been discriminated against, and we didn't like it. I think there is a bright side to that unfortunate affair, the lessons it taught us. A lesson of responsibility, to be responsible for our actions, never to doubt our capabilities in a time of need. Lesson of dignity and respect, to have dignity, we must first gain the respect of others, through accepting responsibilities and being responsible. I really learned the meaning of those three words, yet maybe I have always known but could not grasp their meaning. Well I can now.

I think I can tell you very simply why the last speech class was the most meaningful event to me. Every speaker was natural, in other words, they did not speak from their notes but from their hearts, really feeling their speeches. Most of us agreed that if we could not stand at the podium and speak on what we felt the meaning of the program was without notes, then the program did not really too much meaning for us. Every speech, however, was wonderful. It usually started out as calm and complimentary, then gradually developed into an emotional critique, simple great!

The talent show was very much like the last speech class in that we all expressed our true emotions. We danced, we sang, acted, applauded, screamed, shot waterguns; we simply let ourselves go. No formal ties, no uncertainties, just a group of people getting together and having fun. I think that is the safest way to describe that show.

> There is again an emotional relationship between my last hour on campus and the previous events I mentioned; walking around the campus saying countless goodbys to friends and familiar sights. It was not sadness but more of a disappointing relief -- we were glad to be going home -- but we were grateful for the many experiences, for the wonderful people we had met, but most of all the feeling of being prepared; prepared to accomplish anything the world had to offer.

As we examine the comments of this student and others, the observers are impressed with the importance of three major factcrs which account for the success of the Program: 1) teaching methodology, 2) the opportunity to deal with individual and social problems, and 3) the stance of the University.

It seemed to us that the following teaching practices were especially beneficial:

1. The faculty behaved as if the students had resources that were worth tapping and insisted on their active participation.

2. The faculty never pretended to have a monopoly on truth and invited the students to join in an intellectual partnership.

3. The faculty frequently made the students responsible for the class program, a practice which encouraged self-reliance and the application of peer controls.

4. The faculty made every effort to select materials that were relevant to the lives and experiences of the students.

These principles are scarcely novel. The difference here was that they were actually practiced.

Teaching and the classroom were supplemented by emphasis on non-cognitive factors, such as self-expression, the maintenance of integrity, the importance of intellectual risk, the value of time, the importance of discipline, the avoidance of superficiality and, above all, the possibility of things. These goals were expounded partly through exhortation, partly through precept, but mainly by allowing latent tendencies in the students to flourish. Thus, for example, informal groups were not sacrificed to administrative conformity; the directors refused to rule by fiat; in short, the rhetoric of humane democratic values was substantiated in practice.

These things were possible because the PSSP was not an island surrounded by hostile enemies. At critical points, such as the barbershop incident, the University as host and as symbol of the

broader society supported students and staff. Moreover, it recognized the difficulty of the task, approached it with a commendable absence of dogma, and did not insist on immediate and dramatic evidence of "success."

We do not wish to convey the impression that the PSSP was free of faults. In the next section, we shall make some specific recommendations, many of which imply defects in the current Program. However, the chief difficulty lies in the ambiguities of philosophy which inform this and similar programs. Here, as elsewhere, it is impossible to select appropriate means to achieve goals, if these are either vaguely perceived or beset by internal contradictions.

Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

This report has described the Princeton Summer Studies Program which took place for six weeks during the summer of 1964. Forty boys, predominantly Negro, were recruited from seven high schools located in five cities in New Jersey. All had just completed the tenth grade. Most were functioning below par. The students were selected on the basis of the recommendations of their teachers. Hard data, such as grades, I. Q. and reading scores were held not to be important. Adventuresomeness, creativity -- even rebelliousness -- were the attributes which were to be sought.

The aim of the program was twofold: 1) to help the participating students to want to experience learning for use and 2) to utilize their own resources in doing so. The long-term goal was to increase the number of Negro candidates for first-rate colleges and to discover ways and means of contributing to a secondary school education.

Princeton University brought to this situation several years of experience with a Junior High School Science Project, a program employing the inductive method of teaching, and which is located in forty junior high schools throughout the country. In developing the Summer Studies Program the staff helped to unfold a communications system involving liaison teachers from the sending schools and visitations by Princeton undergraduates to the students, both in their schools and homes, before and after the campus phase of the program. The superintendents of the respective school systems had agreed to cooperate before the staffs of the sending schools were approached.

The students took three courses: Language and Literature; Science; and Sculpture. They worked on jobs for which they earned $1 per hour, one hour per day, five days per week. They resided in dormitories with college students and were involved in a variety of social-recreational activities.

Some of the outcomes of the Program were as follows:

1. Forty per cent of the students revealed noticeable improvement in the opinion of the faculty.

2. When they returned to their respective high schools, 29 of the participating students joined a total of 34 school and twenty community organizations. They also assumed leadership positions within both types of organizations.

3. Their parents observed 64 attitudinal or behavioral changes after the campus phase ended. Sixty of the changes were held to be positive. Fifty per cent of the changes related to learning behavior or attitudes; over forty per cent were changes in social attitudes or behavior.

4. While full information as to their grades prior to enrolling in the program was not available, out of a total of 158 grades earned during the fall of 1964, 27 per cent were "A's," 45 per cent were "B's," 20 per cent were "C's," 6 per cent were "D's," and 1 per cent were "F's." There is a suspicion here that these grades are higher than those which they had earned in the previous semester.

5. Seven informal groups arose during the summer. None of the informal groups were comprised solely of students from only one sending school. In fact, there was only one group whose members came from as few as two sending schools. In four groups, the leadership was clearly established by observations and by the opinions of the members themselves. The leaders of each one of these four groups were ranked higher as students than the other members of the group, in the opinion of the faculty. The students were unaware of the rankings done by the teachers. The teachers were not fully aware of the composition or structure of the groups.

6. One of the sending schools freed a teacher half-time to work with the returning students and their counterparts after the campus phase ended. One school superintendent replaced a principal with one who was more interested in this type of an effort.

7. One school permitted a student to take a math test for course credit on the basis of tutoring provided by a Princeton senior.

8. The liaison teachers, who visited the Program at the expense of Princeton on two occasions during the summer, will spend the entire six weeks on campus next summer.

9. Next summer (1965) five of the students will enroll at Andover Academy; four will be involved in the Outward Bound program; two will go to Exeter Academy, three will spend the summer with the Friends Service Committee in Philadelphia and one will go to Austria on a student exchange program. Several others will spend their summers in employment or in independent study.

In the opinion of the students all of this occurred because of the relationships they established with their teachers, the method of teaching, the role of the college undergraduates, the course content, and their relationships with other students, in rank order. Our observations tend to substantiate this listing, but perhaps in a different rank order.

The response of the University to an incident of discrimination in a local barbershop was a very important "critical incident." It provided an opportunity for the University to demonstrate that it cared about the legitimate concerns of the students. The incident was discussed and analyzed in class discussions. The Director of the Program participated in a test case as a corroborating witness. President Robert F. Goheen sent a strong letter to the barber confirming without a doubt that the expression of his democratic prerogative was not limited to a reading of the Constitution.

The faculty relationships were established through individual conferences, classroom experiences and diningroom contacts. The faculty exposed themselves both as learners and teachers, and stated affirmatively and honestly that they did not have a monopoly on knowledge. They encouraged discussion, thinking out loud, risky guessing, and the use of one's own experiences as instruments of learning. Suspended judgment, steadily deepening analyses, wider and more serious reading, improved ability to express oneself in writing and heightened efforts resulted.

The college students aided in helping the participants to think through their homework assignments, to place greater value on education as a way to increase one's life chances and to learn the intricacies of college life.

The impact of the relationships with other students is revealed through the formation of seven informal groups and a student organization without adult leadership. Another indication of this factor is demonstrated in the instances of those students who were specifically encouraged to apply themselves by a system of social controls set up by the students themselves. A self-appointed but sanctioned committee of five visited the rooms of derelict students and sat quietly by as they studied. It was no accident that three of the five enforcers were Golden Gloves competitors in their home towns. Two of the enforcers revealed noticeable improvement themselves in the opinion of the faculty. Four of the enforcers were later ranked academically in the top half of the class.

In a real sense what happened at Princeton was that the legitimate concerns and available skills of the students were called into social usefulness. Skills in self-organization, self-discipline and in risking oneself, not normally acceptable to staid educators, were held to be appropriate and relevant at Princeton. Normally such skills are overlooked or denied expression. Acts of prejudice against such youth are usually ignored or tacitly condoned through failure to take a prompt counter action.

Finally, when the students raised questions about being labeled "disadvantaged," no lesser person than President Goheen handled their queries. The adequacy of his handling of this question is supported by the fact that PSSP Alumni Groups now exist in Newark and Burlington, New Jersey. The suggestion here is that if minority group youth are approached as if they can achieve, exposed to opportunities to do so, allowed to believe that their life experiences have meaning to those from different backgrounds, they can redeem their lives.

Despite this encouraging record of success, the Program had a number of defects, some of which have been remedied in subsequent years. Several of these deficiencies might inadvertently be incorporated in programs in other institutions and deserve some comment. These include: 1) incomplete data for research and evaluation; 2) inadequate involvement of parents in the Program; 3) vagueness in transmitting goals and objectives to the students; and 4) insufficient exploitation of student formal and informal organizations as a resource for learning. Stated positively, we urge the adoption of the following recommendations for collegiate programs dealing with high school students from "less chance" areas.

Recommendations for data collection

The following personal and social characteristics should be collected for all students:

Students

1. course grades for the past years
2. scores such as I. Q., DAT, Reading Mathematics, etc. for the past two years
3. participation in intra-mural activities, clubs, athletics, etc. (member or officer status)
4. evidence of plans to enroll in college - enrollment in college preparatory courses, requests for same, etc.
5. birth date and place
6. rank in class

Schools

1. ethnic distribution of student body for current years
2. sex distribution of student body for current year
3. percentage of graduates who enter college, by ethnic background and sex.
4. per capita cost
5. median scores (I. Q., DAT, Reading, Math, etc.)
6. population characteristics of the school district (ethnic distribution, years of school completed, income, unemployment, fertility rate, etc.

7. total enrollment
8. average class size
9. number of classes per grade
10. description of curriculum
11. number of full-time permanent faculty (and of substitutes)
12. turnover rate among faculty

Home Towns

See (6.) under data relating to schools. This information should be collected in the census tract in which each participating student resides.

Family

1. educational background, annual income and occupational roles, birth places and dates of parents
2. names, sex, birth date and school grade of all siblings
3. indication of the number of siblings who reside in the home
4. organizational affiliations of parents
5. property owner or renter (if renter, public or private housing)
6. educational goals for son - in the opinion of the parents
7. specific plans made or to be made by parents to promote college attendance by son
8. questions about PSSP?

<u>Recommendations relating to the involvement of parents in the Program</u>

1. All parents should be involved in a meeting on a sending school basis within their home towns, at which time they should be fully apprised of the purpose and function of PSSP. There should be no "hidden agendas." Sending school and PSSP personnel should be present at such meetings.

2. Parental permission should be required for all visits to the campus.

3. Parents should receive copies of all written materials distributed to students: class schedules, recreational schedules, rules and regulations, etc.

4. Appointments should be arranged for personal conference with parents at a mid-point and at the end of the program. Specific information should be transmitted at these times.

5. The campus phase of the program should be opened with a general assembly at which time parents are stimulated to raise questions.

6. End-of-season academic, medical, and psychiatric information should be fully shared with parents.

7. At some point in the program the parents should be urged to visit the program while it is in operation.

8. The liaison teacher of each sending school should be urged to visit the homes of each student before and after the campus phase as a "statutory requirement" to elicit the parents' fuller involvement through providing answers to their questions.

9. At some point during an appropriate course, some discussion should be held both with parents and students as to the role of parents of students - and the role of students as it relates to parents. How can a parent enhance educational motivation in his children? How can a parent retain a role even when a son's education is being fully financed? How can a student attain educational excellence without alienating himself from his parents?

Recommendations for clarification of goals and objectives for the students

1. An educational policy ought to be established which spells out the expectations as to minimal performance or progress as it relates to class attendance, study hours, written work, independent study and the like.

2. Student journals and teacher-student conferences ought to be continued on a regular basis.

3. Channels of communication ought to be established early between the student body and the administration.

4. Decisions to set up special classes as occurred on three occasions during the initial Program should be fully explained to the student body and not handled by counselor-faculty coalitions or individual faculty. There were tinges of favoritism felt by some students when this occurred during the summer of 1964, or else students ended up in classes in which they had not chosen to enroll (urban problems).

5. There were a raft of requests for mathematics. Some effort ought to be made to respond to such requests. Special remediation opportunities ought to be dealt with on a scheduled basis. Similarly, brighter students should be given more challenging assignments.

Recommendations for utilization of student organizational resources

1. Permit students to sit anywhere they want to in class.

2. Pay careful attention as to who supports whom - and who disagrees with whom in class discussions. The tonal quality is often more important than the content of such communications.

3. Give a series of different assignments requiring joint efforts involving small collectivities of students. Permit both volunteering and selection of group members by students.

4. Plan for group presentations with individual responsibility for pieces of total assignments. This will allow differential assignments based on student interest and ability.

5. Periodically, deliberately mix up the groupings to test the pull within the group. Opposition to reassignment to another group may provide a clue.

6. Permit discussion of extra-curricular activities where group participation can be accredited, evaluated and clarified for its members.

7. Accredit group members for the assistance they give to each other.

8. Encourage discussions among the students with the teacher as an observer and learner.

9. Ask students to help each other with homework and assignments. Provide class time for such assistance.

10. Help parents to see the value of such involvement by their children.

11. Accredit such participation in student evaluations.

12. Emphasize progress within groupings, play down individual academic ability.

13. Develop semester-long projects requiring sustained effort and independent effort on behalf of groups - requiring trips to libraries, museums, interviews, observations, etc.

These recommendations will not be equally applicable to all settings. However, their spirit, as distinguished from the specific proposals they contain, seem to us to offer even greater promise of successful accomplishments than the Princeton Summer Studies Program was able to achieve.

Summary

This report describes the activities and some of the consequences of the initial Princeton Summer Studies Program for forty "disadvantaged" high school boys which was conducted during the summer of 1964. The research method employed was participant-observation, supplemented by examination of pertinent records and specially devised surveys. The students, who were predominantly Negro, were selected by seven sending high schools on the basis of their promise, whether or not this was reflected in school grades and other formal criteria. The curriculum consisted of three major courses: Language and Literature; Science; and Art. Every effort was made to take educational clichés seriously, that is to say students were encouraged to think creatively, to question freely, to explore widely, and develop their own self-esteem. Moreover, the University behaved vigorously during a critical incident of racial discrimination and thus persuaded the students in dramatic fashion that organized society could be responsible.

Subsequent analysis of the results suggest that, upon return to their own schools, many of the students exhibited increased academic proficiency, more positive attitudes to learning, and heightened participation in school and community organizations. A substantial number made plans to continue their education in ensuing summers.

The Program may then be considered a qualified "success." According to the students' own testimony, desirable outcomes occurred primarily because of their relationships with their teachers, the method of teaching, the assistance of the college undergraduate counselors, course content, and their interaction with other students. There is reason to believe programs like the PSSP, when suitably modified, might be advantageously adopted on a great number of college campuses.